

Appl. No. 10/572,724
Amendment dated April 6, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2009

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Figure 11. This sheet includes Figure 11 and replaces the original sheet including Figure 11.

Attachment: one (1) replacement sheet

REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 13, 2009, claim 5 was rejected for insufficient antecedent basis. In addition, claims 1-4 and 6-16 were provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended claim 5 as indicated above. In addition, non-elected claims 17-49 have been cancelled. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In summary, claims 1-16 are pending, with claims 1 and 5 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

Interview Summary

On March 23, 2009, the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Cozart, who is in charge of the above-identified patent application. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Cozart for the opportunity to discuss the above-identified patent application during the Interview. An agreement was reached regarding an appropriate amendment to claim 5 to overcome the §112 rejection discussed below. The above amendment to claim 5 reflects this agreement.

Election of Species

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, Applicants' election without traverse in the reply filed November 25, 2008 was acknowledged. Thus, non-elected claims 17-49 were withdrawn from further consideration. Applicants have consequently cancelled claims 17-49.

Drawings

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5). In response, Applicants have filed herewith a Replacement Sheet with the reference numeral 23au properly identified in Figure 11. Applicants believe that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) and 37 CFR 1.121(d). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Specification

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to for typographical errors. In response, Applicants have amended the specification to correct the typographical errors. Specifically, "101" of paragraph [0074], line 2, has been changed to "103." Applicants believe that the specification is now in compliance. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicants have amended claim 5 to clarify the relationship between the concave regions and the first and second walls. In addition, claim 5 has been placed in independent form, as discussed below. Applicants believe that the claim now complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/572,721. In response, Applicants are filing herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321.

Appl. No. 10/572,724
Amendment dated April 6, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2009

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claim 5 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicants have amended claim 5 to overcome the §112 rejection and to place the claim in independent form. Thus, independent claim 5 is believed to be allowable.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/David L. Tarnoff/
David L. Tarnoff
Reg. No. 32,383

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: April 6, 2009

S:\03-MAR09-MS\NS-US065337 Amendment.doc